

APPROVED:

James D Kardach 10/16/2017
UHPA Date

APPROVED:

Melissa 10/20/17
Mānoa Chancellor's Office Date

Department of Geography, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

**PROCEDURES, PRINCIPLES, AND CRITERIA
FOR
THE REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF FACULTY FOR
PROMOTION AND TENURE
Draft last revised by DPC September 8, 2017**

DPC-Selection Procedures

1. Each year, all regular departmental faculty paid from general funds (Bargaining Unit 07) will elect a Personnel Committee consisting of five members. Members will serve for two years with appointment commencing May 15 and will be responsible for new business. Terms will be staggered so that only two or three members retire each year. About April of each year, there will be an election by secret ballot to replace the retiring members.
 - a. All tenured and tenure-track departmental faculty paid from general funds are eligible to vote.
 - b. All departmental faculty with tenure will be eligible to be candidates, with the exception of those faculty: i) whose term on the Personnel Committee has not expired, ii) who are candidates for promotion in the election year, unless special circumstances require, iii) who will be on leave for the next academic year, and iv) who hold the office of Department Chair.
 - c. The runners-up in the election will be alternates in order of votes received, should it be necessary to replace a member between elections.

A member of the departmental staff assigned by the Department Chair will be responsible for conducting the election. In the event of a tie, a second vote will be conducted, and if the second vote is also a tie, the vote will be decided by coin toss. The Department Chair will be responsible for notifying the department of the results of DPC election.
 - d. The Personnel Committee will choose its own Chair each year. Wherever possible the Chair shall be a second-year member. Recommendations and other actions of the Personnel Committee shall be reported promptly to faculty by the Committee Chair.
2. Each year the Personnel Committee shall review the procedures, principles, and criteria and recommend any alterations to the department. The amendments approved by

majority vote of all BU 07 faculty will be sent, through the Dean of the College, to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for review and to the Union for approval.

Contract-Renewal Procedures

3. To fulfill University requirements for contract renewal, non-tenured probationary faculty members will submit a short report to the Department Chair (henceforth, the Chair) on activities since their initial hire, or since their last contract-renewal evaluation, whichever is later. The report should describe their efforts and achievements as regards instruction, advising, research, and service. The Department believes probationary faculty early in their academic careers should emphasize research and instruction over service, and those areas will be given priority in the subsequent evaluation.
4. The Chair will provide the DPC with each probationary member's report any solicited letters and ask it to prepare a written evaluation, including a final DPC vote by secret ballot, as input to the Chair's own assessment. If the member has been evaluated in the past, the DPC may request, and the Chair must provide, copies of the earlier evaluations to help it gauge the member's progress.
5. The Chair will also evaluate the faculty member's report and, considering the DPC's commentary, will communicate in writing to the probationary member the Chair's and the DPC's evaluation of the individual's progress toward promotion and tenure. The DPC Chair and the Departmental Chair (separate and independent of the DPC) will also be available for consultation with the probationary member upon the latter's request.
6. Solicited letters will be destroyed by the DPC. All other evaluation materials, or copies thereof, collected during this procedure shall be retained by the Chair for use in future such evaluations, unless expressly prohibited by law or University regulations.

Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

7. The evaluation process for promotion and tenure will be appropriate to an academic community, and will display due regard for evidence. Prejudgment and personal bias should play no part in these proceedings. The academic freedom of all persons concerned will be respected. Confidentiality will be strictly maintained in accordance with rules laid down by the University and the collective bargaining agreement.
8. The candidate should assume the responsibility of providing such material as the Personnel Committee deems necessary to address the criteria (see "Criteria of Evaluation" pp 5-9), including teaching evaluations. Such requirements shall apply equally in the case of candidates for promotion and for tenure.
9. The committee shall undertake the solicitation and collection of references and other data concerning the candidate in the following ways:

- a. Following established university procedures, the DPC shall obtain at least five external references from relevant scholars at or above the rank sought by the candidate and from outside the immediate university community, i.e., excluding scholars from within the University of Hawai'i system and the East-West Center. The external referees will be given the curriculum vitae of the candidate and copies of up to five of the candidate's publications, and will be asked to evaluate the research quality and productivity of the candidate.
 - b. External referees will be selected from lists prepared by the candidate and the DPC. The candidate will be asked to put forward the names of 5-10 (or more if requested by the DPC) individuals qualified to evaluate her/his research. The DPC will identify other qualified scholars. The number of external references obtained from the candidate's list and utilized in the DPC evaluation will not exceed the number obtained from the DPC's list. If additional letters are required, additional qualified scholars will be identified by the DPC, and these letters will be solicited.
 - c. Reference letters from external referees as indicated in 9(a) would be part of the candidate's application forwarded to University administrative levels above that of the Chair.
 - d. No unsolicited information in the possession of the Department Chair, TPRC, or any UH administrator prior to DPC review may be included in a dossier unless it is provided to the candidate and the candidate is given the opportunity to provide a written response. No unsolicited material shall be accepted or included once the DPC begins its review.
 - e. Anonymous material from individuals will not be accepted.
 - f. The DPC will make every effort to maintain the confidentiality of all referees who submit letters as part of the review process.
10. It is recognized that some candidates may be holders of joint appointments and in such cases the departmental Personnel Committee shall assess whether the candidate's performance -- be it teaching and advising, research, or service -- is consonant with the proportion of time assigned for each task and the resources at the individual's disposal. The evaluation of services performed for another unit shall be the primary responsibility of that unit.
 11. If the candidate requests, the Committee is available to discuss procedures, options, and evidence to assist in the preparation of a case. If the candidate requests, the Departmental Chair, separate and independent from the DPC, is also available to assist.
 12. The Committee will discuss each case, using all the evidence accumulated, and respecting established principles and criteria. The Committee Chair will call for a secret

ballot at the conclusion of the discussion. On the basis of its deliberations and ballot the committee will prepare its report, and append a recommendation if they so desire.

13. Candidates will be given the opportunity to read the completed report on their own case before it is forwarded to the Department Chair. After this review, the candidate may exercise the option to meet with the full committee. The candidate may respond to the statements of the Committee and points of concern will be discussed. As a result of this discussion, the Committee may amend its report.
14. The Committee Chair will forward the final report produced in each case to the Department Chair. The Department Chair then makes an independent recommendation on the applicant's tenure or promotion. The Department Chair shall not participate by voice, vote, presence, or any other form of communication in the deliberations of the DPC over individual tenure and/or promotion applications.
15. The Committee Chair will report to the departmental faculty after the final disposition of the case and will give a brief account of each decision. The committee may also make recommendations to the department in future personnel matters.
16. The materials assembled by the DPC will be retained until the final disposition of the case, including resolutions of all possible appeals, and then handled in the following ways:
 - a. Materials submitted by the candidate shall be returned to the candidate.
 - b. All confidential materials will be separated and transferred to the Chair for appropriate handling.
 - c. Non-confidential materials will be separated and transferred to the Department Chair for proper storage.

Principles of Academic Performance

17. Promotion is judged primarily on performance and accomplishment; tenure may also be affected by potential. The levels of accumulated accomplishment necessary for promotion at the different ranks should vary. For example, Professors will be expected to have achieved and to have maintained authority in their specialization, with recognition at the national, and preferably at the international, level. Associate Professors are expected to have made significant contributions in their field of specialization and should be in the process of achieving national or international recognition. Assistant Professors should be most concerned with developing their personal talents for teaching and research.
18. The University requires that faculty devote a substantial portion of their time to teaching and advising. Since the well-being of students and the reputation of the department

within the University are closely related to the quality of teaching, a faculty member must demonstrate competence in these fields.

19. Further expectations of faculty will include research and publication, student advising (formal and informal), and service to the institution and to professional and social organizations at various levels.
20. It cannot be assumed that faculty will be equally effective, or even be able to contribute more than nominally in all these areas. Within a review of a faculty member for promotion or tenure, some allowances should be made for individual choice, talent, and specialization.
21. A faculty member is expected to subscribe to the concept of the University as an intellectual community. Implied in an acceptance of this principle are such features as the possession of and regard for superior intellectual attainment, a willing subscription to accepted academic ethics, and devotion to a continuing and genuine pursuit of knowledge and personal intellectual development.
22. The academic performance of a faculty member under review will be considered primarily from the standpoint of the candidate's contributions to general departmental effectiveness, up to the levels required by the department. Where other considerations must be taken into account, such as the personality or habits of the candidate, deficiencies must be sufficient magnitude to materially impair the effectiveness and functioning of the department.
23. It is the primary responsibility of the faculty member under consideration to build his/her own case for the proposed review. However, it may be the decision of the Personnel Committee to refer the statement back to the candidate for supplementation or reworking, if the committee decides that the statement is insufficient to present the candidate in the best possible light.
24. It is recognized that the concerns and requirements of the department, and those of the administering agencies within the University and the State government, do not necessarily always coincide. Where a divergence develops, the first obligation of the committee is to the wellbeing of the department, and to the fair treatment of its faculty.

Criteria of Evaluation

25. Teaching – general expectations regardless of rank and tenure:
 - a. In teaching, the department expects its faculty to offer courses that will inform and challenge the student by means of appropriate lectures, discussions, seminars, readings, instructional techniques, and examinations. There should be continued evidence of growth in mastery of the subject, in course development, and in the candidate's self-evaluation. At appropriate times each year, faculty will be

requested to initiate some form of student evaluation of courses in question. It is in the candidate's best interests to: i) hold such evaluations, and ii) to use standard, campus-wide techniques when appropriate, in order that these may be compared with those of other departments.

- b. A faculty member's teaching performance occupies a special place in any recommendation for promotion and tenure (see 18 above). Whatever its other qualities, individual teaching performance must exhibit superior intellectual attainment if it is to be the basis for positive recommendations. The committee will take into account that there are many types and styles of teaching, and that even within a single discipline special pedagogical problems and opportunities for different approaches will occur in different specialties. Instructors will be expected to adopt goals and methods that reflect their particular interests. It is essential that the committee take into account the objectives of the faculty member in question, as well as the more obvious features of his/her performance. The following kinds of questions can be posed in a teaching assessment:

- i. Is there adequate command of the subject?
- ii. Is there evidence of ability and willingness to keep up with current developments in the field?
- iii. Is there indication of an ability to present materials in an organized and logical fashion?
- iv. Is there a grasp of the fundamental objectives and values of the instructor's special field, and is this related to other fields of knowledge?
- v. Is there the ability to teach in an interesting and effective way so that the enthusiasm of students is aroused and maintained?
- vi. Are class presentations and discussions encouraged, stimulated, and effectively guided?
- vii. Is there evidence of the ability to stimulate, advise, and direct students?
- viii. Where appropriate, does the instructor seem willing to innovate and experiment with, techniques that may improve effectiveness?
- ix. Is the instructor willing to receive and react to assessments by students and colleagues?
- x. What guest lectureships have been made, both within the department and elsewhere?
- xi. What kinds of research, fieldwork, or course instruction have been produced, outside the normal context of the candidate's teaching schedule?

- c. While the above are general principles for teaching evaluation regardless of rank and status, it is recognized that the criteria for promotion and tenure in this regard should vary according to rank and experience. For example, a recent graduate with little background is understandably feeling his/her way in this delicate art and the struggle to gain additional expertise should be taken into account by the departmental personnel committee in its review. Conversely, efforts by experienced teachers to avoid stagnation in teaching, through new approaches and

materials, should be noted. Within the department, it may also be that the candidate has been asked to teach a course that lies outside particular disciplinary interests and at which optimal effectiveness will be difficult, especially at first. Willingness to perform such service, as well as success, should play a part in the evaluation.

Aside from the student and other evaluations alluded to, other indications of teaching performance could include: peer evaluations, course outlines and handouts in general, reading and other assignments, copies of papers submitted by students together with the instructor's comments, and examinations given. All should give evidence of continuing process by the candidate along the lines of the questions posed above.

26. Advising – general expectations regardless of rank and tenure:

- a. The evaluation of a candidate's advisory duties involves a more subtle appraisal than that for teaching, and it should be weighted accordingly. Teaching normally involves the transmission and explanation to the class of an established corpus of knowledge, or of that which is believed to be true at the time. Such presentations are therefore usually well structured, and can be based on, or make use of, selected and limited texts and articles. Advising, on the other hand, tends by its very nature to be less structured and more open-ended. It often relates not so much to what is known at the time, but to what one would like to know, or to what one knows but does not fully comprehend. The adviser thus has to be familiar with, and appraise for the student, a vast range of bibliographic and other reference sources, not only in the discipline itself, but also in related disciplines. Good advising thus involves a heavy and direct participation in the research of the student, and the end product of such research inevitably bears the imprint of such influence and direction.

The following questions should provide some insight into a candidate's advisory capacities:

- i. Do the candidate's advisees raise substantive and clearly identifiable issues in their research papers, theses or dissertations?
 - ii. What degree of progress have advisees achieved in prosecuting these objectives?
 - iii. For those studies brought to a conclusion, what has been the level of accomplishment?
- b. The work of an adviser should normally demonstrate improvement and increasing effectiveness according to experience, for which the quality of the candidate's graduate advisee, and especially of their writings in attainment of their academic goals, should provide testimony.

27. Research and Publication – general expectations regardless of rank and tenure:

- a. In research the department expects each faculty member to demonstrate continued commitment to independent research, the results of which should be communicated regularly to faculty colleagues and to outside audiences in ways that are appropriate to the research and the discipline. For example, such could take the form of published articles and books, working papers, monographs, research proposals, and grant applications, maps, computer programs, and presentations at colloquia, as well as special lectures, and participation in regional, national, or international meetings. All faculty will be expected to make at least one presentation each year in a faculty-Ph.D. research seminar.
- b. As a member of a university, and especially of a reputable Graduate Department, a faculty member in the Professional ranks is expected to develop new knowledge and to disseminate it in the form of published research. The research produced in the department is related to the caliber of the new faculty and students attracted, the potential effectiveness of the department's service function, and its ability to stimulate the interest of external funding agencies. For these reasons, a faculty member's research should be evaluated rather than merely enumerated. In addition to reviewing already published works, efforts should be made to probe the faculty member's goals, insights, and directions as a researcher.
- c. Assessments of the quality of the published research might include:
 - i. the acceptance of a paper by a reputable journal;
 - ii. the opinions of outside specialists in the candidate's research field;
 - iii. the opinions of other faculty members who are familiar with the candidate's work;
 - iv. an invited paper;
 - v. citations;
 - vi. the relevance of each publication to the candidate's research goals, and, if appropriate, to the aims and objectives of the department.

28. Service -- general expectations regardless of rank and tenure:

In service, the department expects its faculty to contribute to the administration of the department through active participation in the work of its committees. Each faculty member should belong to at least one but no more than two departmental committees. In addition, the department welcomes the participation of its faculty in the work of other committees and arms of the University, as well as in the profession at large, and in the local community. However, insofar as such work is concerned, participation should be commensurate with the availability of the individual over and above departmental duties.

Departmental Responsibilities

29. When the promotion and tenure dossiers are returned to the department after the final disposition of the cases, the Department Chair will remove and destroy all confidential letters from external referees. The Department Chair will retain one copy of the dossier without confidential letters for departmental records and oversee the proper disposal of all extra copies.
30. A copy of these Procedures, Principles, and Criteria for the Review of Faculty Promotion and Tenure will be distributed to all department faculty at the time of appointment, when revised, or upon request.

5 March 1976
Revised 25 March 1976
Revised 11 May 1982
Corrected 24 September 1987
Reprinted 28 November 1995
Revised 7 May 1996
Revised 27 May 1997
Revised 16 September 1997
Revised 12 October 1997
Reviewed by DPC and Chair 1 March 2011
Draft for faculty review 26 September 2012
Reviewed by VCAA 29 August 2013
Revised by DPC 14 November 2014
Reviewed by VCAA 14 January 2015
Draft 12 July 2015
Revised by DPC 21 June 2017
Reviewed by VCAA 21 August 2017
Revised by DPC 8 Sep 2017